



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/658,839 | 09/09/2003 | Keman Yu | MS1-1685US | 6178 |
| 22801 | 7590 | 11/29/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201 | | | LEE, Y YOUNG | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2621 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 11/29/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/658,839 | Applicant(s) YU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Y. Lee | Art Unit 2621 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Y. Lee. (3) _____

(2) Mr. C. Lattin. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 32, 40 and 41.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hsu and Sezan et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Lattin briefly explained the differences between the prior art and the current invention. Examiner explained that the various motion vector accuracy levels of Sezan et al in combination of the motion vector candidate selection technique of Hsu et al meets the claims 32 and 40 in their broadest reasonable sense. However, claim 41 is patentable over the prior arts with respect to the particular candidate arrangements.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required